

The concept of limiting the voices and agendas of a public appears to contradict the basic idea of free speech. How is it progressive and productive or democratic, when the ideas and agendas of a few are disseminated to the masses unless this is a part of an overall political agenda. That the FCC appears to be unwilling to inform and hear from the public as to how the public receives information smacks of agenda and paranoia. If there is a legitimate argument for deregulation and the public benefit of such, I have not heard it, not even from Rupert Murdoch. Deregulation appears to be about monopoly building and information filtering. I fear this is a road to the further erosion of our civil liberties. Why change? Why indeed.